

*Attorney Docket No.: E0523-38/AU0305032***REMARKS**

1. Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 2 and 4-12 stand finally rejected and claims 13-20 stand withdrawn. This paper amends claims 1, 2, 4-12 and cancels claims 13-20.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

2. Withdrawn claims 13-20 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. The Applicants reserve the right to refile claims 13-20 in a divisional application.

3. The Office Action has been made final by the Examiner. The Applicants respectfully submit that the final rejection is premature and therefore, request withdrawal of same.

37 CFR 1.104 (b) states:

The examiner's action will be complete as to all matters, except that in appropriate circumstances, such as misjoinder of invention, fundamental defects in the application, and the like, the action of the examiner may be limited to such matters before further action is made.

In the first Office Action on the merits mailed on August 16, 2005, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner did not understand certain terms used in the claims, such as "wider section", even after reviewing the specification drawings of the application. The Examiner did not apply prior art to the claims because "claims 1-12 were so informal that no meaningful examination could be undertaken at that time."

*Attorney Docket No.: E0523-38/AU0305032*

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification of the present application clearly identified and explained terms such as “a wider section of the pad,” and references were clearly made to such terms in the drawings. For example, page 4, paragraph [0030] through page 5, paragraph [0032] states, referencing Figs. 6-12:

...Each electrode (100) has a line width, measured transverse to the length of the electrode (100). Each electrode (100) has a bus line conductor (104) of narrow line width at each intersection (110) with an enlarged pad (102) of wider line width. According to the invention, an intersection (110) is defined at a location where the line width of an electrode (100) begins to increase, and, thereby, becomes a line width of a pad (102) that joins the bus line conductor (104) of narrower line width... The invention avoids an intersection (110) of a bus line conductor (104) with a pad (102) at its widest line width on a widest section (112) of a pad (102). Instead, the intersection (110) has a line width that is smaller than the line width of a pad (102) at its widest section (112). At an intersection (110) of each pad (102) with a corresponding bus line conductor (104), a line width of the pad (102) is wider than a line width of the bus line conductor (104), and is substantially narrower than a line width of a wider section (114) of the pad (102). The line width of the pad (102) at the intersection (110) is substantially narrower, which means that the line width is purposely dimensioned to be narrower, than the line width of a wider section (114) of the pad (102)...

As can be seen, claims 1-12 could have reasonably been understood from the specification and the drawings of the application, and therefore, were not so informal, as to make them incapable of examination, as contended by the Examiner. Moreover, MPEP 702.01 only allows for incomplete examination of applications when the application includes an informal or insufficient disclosure, and states that a reasonable

*Attorney Docket No.: E0523-38/AU0305032*

search should be made of the invention so far as it can be understood from the disclosure and claims.

Since the Examiner failed to provide a complete first Office Action, the final rejection in the present Office Action is premature. Accordingly, withdrawal of the final rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, and 11 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,164,678 to Biazzo et al. (Biazzo).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

An electrode for a plasma display panel, comprising:  
a plurality of bus line conductors having a first width; and  
a plurality of non-circular pads, each of the pads having a first section having a maximum width that is greater than the first width, each of the pads having a second section that is narrower than the maximum width, the second section of each of the pads intersecting a corresponding one of the bus line conductors.

Claims 2, 4, 7 and 11 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments made to claim 1.

Biazzo does not expressly or inherently describe, teach or suggest an electrode comprising inter alia, a plurality of non-circular pads. Biazzo describes and shows a circular or round pad and states in column 6, lines 6-10:

Pad *ij* is illustratively round. This ensures that discharges occur at corresponding points on each pad since discharges will occur where the pad/column conductor gap is the smallest.

*Attorney Docket No.: E0523-38/AU0305032*

Hence, claim 1 is clearly allowable over Biazzo.

With respect to claims 2, 4, 7, and 11, which depend directly from claim 1 and recite additional features of the invention, these claims are allowable over Biazzo for at least the same reasons as stated for claim 1.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

5. Claims 5, 6, and 8-10 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biazzo. In support of this rejection, the Examiner argues that the pad shapes are a design alternatives.

Claims 5, 6, and 8-10 have been amended to be consistent with the amendments made to claim 1.

As indicated above, Biazzo does not expressly or inherently describe, teach or suggest an electrode comprising inter alia, a plurality of non-circular pads, as now required by claim 1. Since claims 5, 6, and 8-10 depend directly from claim 1, these claims are allowable over Biazzo for at least the same reasons as stated for claim 1.

Moreover, Biazzo teaches that the pads should be round to ensure that discharges occur at corresponding points on each pad (see column 6, lines 6-10 of Biazzo). Hence, Biazzo teaches away from non-circular pads, as now recited in the claims. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to modify the round pads of Biazzo to be non-circular, as claimed.


In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

*Attorney Docket No.: E0523-38/AU0305032*

6. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested as it is believed that all outstanding issues have been addressed herein and, further, that claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or matters whose resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

7. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17, which are associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2061.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Schwarz  
Registration No. 37,577

***Duane Morris LLP***  
P.O. Box 5203  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203  
609-631-2446 - Tel  
609-631-2401 - Fax

DM2V703588.1